



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/117,970 08/07/98 FINN

D 59276

MC GLEW AND TUTTLE  
SCARBOROUGH STATION  
SCARBOROUGH NY 10510-0827

QM12/0819

EXAMINER

ARBES, C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3729

DATE MAILED:

08/19/99

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Group Art Unit

**—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—****Period for Response**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE three (3) MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

**Status**

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on July 21, 1999.
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- ☒ Claim(s) 40-78 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☒ Claim(s) 78 is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) ~~56-57~~ 40-51, 53, 55-57, 59, 60, 62-63, 66 is/are rejected.
- ☒ Claim(s) 52, 54, 58, 61, 64, 65, 67 is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)**

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Attachment(s)**

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892 ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Office Action Summary**

Art Unit: 3206

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 3, lines 18-21 and on page 12, lines 21-23 Applicants recite a disclosure which is incompatible with current U.S. Patent Office practice inasmuch as the specification requires that one read the claims in the application in order to understand the specification. Moreover inasmuch as claims 1-3, 34 and 35 have been canceled it cannot be understood why Applicants have not heretofore canceled the language on pages 3 and 12. It is requested that these statements on pages 3 and 12 be canceled forthwith. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 56, 57, 59 and 60 recite the limitation " of the aluminum surface ", " on the aluminum surface " , "of the aluminum surface" and "onto the aluminum face" in the claims. There is insufficient antecedent bases for these limitation in the claims.

Claims 62 and 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 62 is held to be unclear, vague and indefinite inasmuch as applicants fail to properly have the claim depend from another dependent or independent claim.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 40-51, 53, 55, 62(as understood), 63(as understood), and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japan Pat No. 62-008313 by Noriyuki et al,;

Art Unit: 3206

hereinafter '313. The '313 teaches a magnetic head wherein a coil having wire terminals is bonded to a flat substrate having a conductive pattern thereon. The wire terminals can be bonded to the substrate by means of a laser, solder or by ultrasonic means. It is held that the use of a chip unit is merely intended use (Claim 40) and hence it is given no patentable weight. Alternatively it is held to have been obvious to provide a chip unit on the patterned substrate in order to power and command the coil which is also attached to the substrate. As further applied to Claim 50 it is held to mere design choice to provide that the substrate is made from a fleece material, including one of paper or cardboard inasmuch as Applicants provide no purpose or solve no problems from the use of this material.

Claims 52, 54, 58, 61, 64, 65 and 67 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


Claim 78 is held to be allowable.

Further pertinent prior art is as follows. Bain et al. show a method of making electrical circuit boards wherein groove and holes are formed in a substrate to receive conductors and terminals respectively. Helms shows a method of connecting terminals of a component to interconnecting means using electrodes. Swiggett et al. show a method of making wiring by using adhesives to bond conductors to a board surface. Hasegawa et al show a method and apparatus for wiring circuit boards including a plurality of electronic components. Gustafson shows a

Art Unit: 3206

process for assembling a coil onto a printed circuit whereby soldering of two end wires of the coil can occur. Yamada et al show a method and apparatus for laying wire onto an insulating plate.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to C.J. Arbes at telephone number (703) 308-1857.

  
Carl J. Arbes  
Primary Examiner